

**REMARKS**

In response to the Office Action of November 4, 2009, claims 1, 22, 25,32 and 41 have been amended to recite “wherein said dynamically notifying further comprises directly identifying said wireless terminal to said at least one other communicating party.” Support for this amendment can be found in the application as filed, including at page 13, lines 4-12 and at page 14, lines 4-10.

**Claim Rejections- 35 U.S.C. §103**

At section 6 of the Office Action, claims 1-8, 10-12, 22, 25-28, 32 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by Wu et al (US 7,039,721, hereinafter Wu), in view of Mehta et al. (U.S. 2003/0028671, hereinafter Mehta).

With respect to claims 1, 22, 25 and 32, it is asserted by the Office that Wu discloses a system for providing address information for reaching a terminal, the system comprising a wireless communication network, a wireless terminal coupled to the communication network and being configured to have a varying public address, and the wireless terminal being configured to be reachable from outside of the wireless communication network by means of the varying public address; and at least one other communicating party, being an originating party of communication between the wireless terminal and the at least one other communication party; the wireless terminal being configured to dynamically notify substantially directly the at least one other communicating party of a current public address of the terminal, with reference made Figure 1; column 3, lines 52-55; column 5, lines 37-57; column 6, lines 1-25; and column 6, line 62—column 7, line 4. It is stated that Wu does not expressly disclose that the varying of the public address is occurring prior to the public address being dynamically allocated to the wireless terminal, but that Mehta from the same or similar fields of endeavor discloses this feature, with reference made to paragraphs [0011] and [0015]. Thus, the Office asserts it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement the varying of the public address occurring prior to the public address being dynamically allocated to the wireless terminal as taught by Mehta, into the system of Wu in order to insure a greater degree of security. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

In the "Response to Arguments" section of the Office Action, in rejecting Applicant's earlier contention that Wu does not disclose that the secret host of Wu is a wireless terminal connected to a wireless communication network, the Office asserts that it interprets "...the secret host and the public host as being wireless terminals" (Office Action, page 4, lines 19-20). As amended, claim 1 recites that dynamically notifying substantially directly at least one other communicating party of a current public address of said wireless terminal further comprises directly identifying said wireless terminal to the at least one other communicating party. Thus, the at least one other communicating party is notified of both the current public address of the wireless terminal (which the claim recites also has a private address) and the identity of the same wireless terminal.

The secret host of Wu, which the Office has interpreted as the wireless terminal of the present invention, is never identified to other parties. Wu states at column 6, lines 1-7:

The secret host 18 accepts IP packets from the public host 22 and processes them accordingly. The secret host 18 responds by sending packets out with the public host IP address so that it appears that all data is being sent directly from the secret host. This further protects the identity of the secret host 18.

Rather than identify itself when it sends packets, the secret host identifies the public host as the source, which has been interpreted by the office to be an entirely separate wireless terminal. Thus, the receiver of the packets is never aware that it received them from the secret host. In addition, when the public node is attacked, "[t]he secret host may also send a message to the DNS server 26 requesting that it replace the IP address of the public host 22 with the IP address of the alternate host 60. The alternate host 60 then forwards packets to the secret host 18" (Wu, column 6, lines 19-23). Although another option when the public host is under attack is for the secret host to notify select clients of an alternate public node IP address (Wu, column 6, lines 63-65), there is no disclosure in Wu that teaches or suggests the secret host ever identifies itself. Rather, the secret host refers the clients to a different public address which can be used to reach a public host that will forward requests to the secret host, thereby protecting the identity of the secret host.

Furthermore, not only is the secret host in Wu not identified to other communicating parties, but any addition of such a feature to Wu would be contrary to the purpose of the invention. The purpose of Wu is to protect the secret host, thus, if communications were sent from the secret host using a public IP address which identifies the secret host as the source of the communication, rather than using a public IP address which identifies a public host as the source, it would defeat the purpose of using a public host, which is the crux of the invention in Wu.

Therefore, because Wu, as well as Mehta, fail to disclose all of the features of claim 1 as amended, and these features would not have been obvious to person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 as amended is in allowable form and is not suggested in view of the cited references.

Independent claims 22, 25, 32, and 41 have all been amended in a manner similar to claim 1 and, for similar reasons as those presented above, each of these independent claims is also believed to be neither anticipated nor suggested by Wu.

Furthermore, at least in view of their dependency on the aforementioned independent claims, it is respectfully submitted that dependent claims 2-8, 10-12, and 26-28 are also not anticipated by Wu and are in allowable form.

At section 7 of the Office Action, claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wu, in view of Mehta, and in further view of Ebata et al. (US 2002/0173310, hereinafter Ebata). However, because claim 9 is dependent from claim 1, which as stated above is not anticipated by Wu, it is respectfully submitted that claim 9 is not unpatentable over Wu, in view of Mehta, in further view of Ebata and is in allowable form.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application as amended is in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

The undersigned respectfully submits that no fee is due for filing this Amendment. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge to deposit account 23-0442 any fee deficiency required to submit this paper.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: February 4, 2010

/Alfred A. Fressola/

WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS  
& ADOLPHSON LLP  
Bradford Green, Building Five  
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224  
Monroe, CT 06468  
Telephone: (203) 261-1234  
Facsimile: (203) 261-5676  
USPTO Customer No. 004955

Alfred A. Fressola  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 27,550